



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/526,412

03/02/2005

Thomas Anthony Stahl

PU020417

6515

24498

7590

07/08/2008

Joseph J. Laks

Thomson Licensing LLC

2 Independence Way, Patent Operations

PO Box 5312

PRINCETON, NJ 08543

EXAMINER

RECEK, JASON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/526,412	Applicant(s) STAHL ET AL.	
	Examiner JASON RECEK	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the amendment filed on April 9th 2008 which concerns application 10/526412.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claims 1-17 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that Metin does not disclose establishing a reserved connection "for one reserved connection path at a given time" as recited by the independent claims 1 and 9. Applicant does not dispute that Metin discloses establishing reserved connections for multiple paths (pg. 7). In the disclosure of Metin an example is given where multiple hosts engage in a video conference (paragraph 39). This results in multiple paths. While not explicitly disclosed by Metlin, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Metlin also teaches one reserved path when only two hosts are present. Nevertheless, a new ground of

rejection is made in view of Golden et al. US 6,563,793 B1 since it better describes a singular reserved connection path.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock et al. U.S. Pat. 6,678,248 B1 in view of Metin et al. US 2002/0031142 A1 and Golden et al. US 6,563,793 B1.

Regarding claim 1, Haddock discloses “a switch in packet communication” as a network switch (col. 3 ln. 46-48), “the switch is adapted to detect and forward packets that contain prioritized data” as a switch that handles quality of service (col. 3 ln. 48-50), “the switch comprises a plurality of output queues associated with egress ports of the switch that correspond to different priorities associated with received priority packets” as a switch that has a plurality of output queues (col. 6 ln. 7-8), “additional output queue that is established and associated with reserved connection data packets” as a quality of service queue that is reserved for specific traffic (col. 6 ln. 7-12), and “each packet received [...] determining whether the packet is associated with the reserved connection

and forwarding those packets to the additional output queue” as a switch that is able to look at the packet and make forwarding decisions (col. 4 ln. 38-48, col. 9 ln. 42-50).

Haddock does not disclose “packets that include requests for reserved connections” or “the switch [...] in response to a reserved connection request, determining whether there is sufficient bandwidth available to establish a reserved connection path within the network, and if so, establishing a reserved connection path and allocating the bandwidth for the reserved connection path” however these are taught by Metin as a packet switched network that uses Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) which would carry packets that include requests for reserved connections (pg. 4 paragraph 37) and switches that reserve resources if they are available and include control logic to perform QoS (paragraphs 36-40). Metlin does not explicitly disclose that only a single connection path is reserved at a given time, although one of ordinary skill in the art would understand this to occur when only 2 hosts are present. Nevertheless, the limitation “output queue that is established ... for one reserved connection path at a given time” is explicitly taught by Golden as establishing a single reserved connection path through a switch from one host to another (col. 9 ln. 14 - col. 10 ln. 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haddock with the switches of Metin that are able to process RSVP. The reason for doing so would be to conform with network reservation protocols. Furthermore it would also have been obvious to allow the switch to reserve multiple paths as disclosed by Metin or restrict the switch to reserve a single path as taught by

Golden. The motivation for doing so is to provide the necessary QoS. No modification of Metin is even required for doing so, rather instead of logically grouping several hosts, only two hosts are grouped (Metin paragraphs 6-10).

Regarding claim 2, Haddock discloses “the network comprises an Ethernet network” (col. 4 ln. 7).

Regarding claim 3, Haddock does not disclose “switches are coupled to one another in cascading fashion” however Metin discloses multiple switches in a path between hosts (pg. 4 paragraph 40) and such switches are capable of receiving reserved connection requests and reserving resources (pg. 4 paragraph 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haddock with the switches of Metin that are able to process RSVP. The reason for doing so would be to conform with network reservation protocols.

Regarding claim 4, Haddock discloses “[switch having] an internal mapping table” (col. 8 ln. 65-67, col. 9 ln. 48-50).

Regarding claim 5, Haddock does not specifically disclose “forwarding the reserved connection request to all output ports when the internal mapping table does not include the requested destination address”. However it is well known to one of

Art Unit: 2142

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that when a switch does not know a destination address the packet may be forwarded to all ports (with the possible exception of the incoming port). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to flood non-matching packets for the purpose of forwarding connection requests to all output ports when the requested destination address is unknown. The motivation being, to enhance packet forwarding.

Regarding claim 6, Haddock does not disclose “switch is operable to generate a signal indicating denial of bandwidth allocation back toward the requesting device” however this is taught by Metin as a switch that runs RSVP would necessarily be able to send Path-Err messages upstream (pg. 4 paragraphs 37, 39)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haddock with the switches of Metin that are able to process RSVP. The reason for doing so would be to conform with network reservation protocols.

Regarding claim 7, Haddock discloses “the switch operates at one of service layer 2 and service layer 3” as a switch that uses layer 2 and layer 3 information (col. 4 ln. 38-40).

Regarding claim 8, Haddock does not disclose using RSVP however this is taught by Metin (pg. 4 paragraph 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haddock with the switches of Metin that are able to process RSVP. The reason for doing so would be to conform with network reservation protocols.

Regarding claim 9, Haddock discloses “switch comprising: an input for receiving packets from one of the at least two end stations” as network switch with ports (col. 3 ln. 46-48), “a plurality of out queues [that correspond to priorities of packets]” as a number of quality service queues (col. 3 ln. 48-50), “at least one additional output queue associated with reserved connection data packets” as a quality of service queue that is reserved for specific traffic (col. 6 ln. 7-12), “a packet sorter” as a forwarding database (col. 4 ln. 38-48). Haddock does not disclose “detector for detecting whether the received packet includes a request for a reserved connection” nor “allocator [for determining and allocating sufficient bandwidth]” however these are taught by Metin as a switch that handles RSVP which includes reserved connection requests and control logic for performing QoS (paragraphs 36-37) and a switch that can allocate the necessary resources (paragraphs 39-40).

Metlin does not explicitly disclose that only a single connection path is reserved at a given time, although one of ordinary skill in the art would understand this to occur when only 2 hosts are present. Nevertheless, the limitation “output queue that is established ... for one reserved connection path at a given time” is explicitly taught by

Golden as establishing a single reserved connection path through a switch from one host to another (col. 9 ln. 14 - col. 10 ln. 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Haddock with the switches of Metin that are able to process RSVP. The reason for doing so would be to conform with network reservation protocols. The motivation for combining Golden with Metlin is the same as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, it is substantially similar to claim 3 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 11, Haddock discloses “switch examines at least one of MAC address information and IP address information of each packet” as a switch that uses layer 2 and layer 3 information to make decisions (col. 4 ln. 38-42).

Regarding claim 12, Haddock discloses “switch compares the input packet address information with pair addresses stored in memory” as a switch using a forwarding database (col. 4 ln. 38-48), and “if the pairs match [...] packet is sent to the at least one additional output queue” as a switch that sends a matching packet to a specific output port based on quality of service (col. 3 ln. 50-54, col. 4 ln. 46-48).

4. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Metin in view of Golden.

Regarding claim 13, Metin discloses “a first network switch device receiving and detecting prioritized packets and packets that include requests for reserved connections” as a network with a switch which recognizes RSVP (pg. 4 paragraph 37), “forwarding the prioritized packets” as switches that forward packets (Fig. 2), “determining, by said first network switch device whether sufficient bandwidth is available [for establishing a path]” as a network switch in a path that determines and reserves the necessary resources (paragraphs 39-40). Metlin does not explicitly disclose that only a single connection path is reserved at a given time, although one of ordinary skill in the art would understand this to occur when only 2 hosts are present. Nevertheless, the limitation “allocating an output queue for buffering ... [one] reserved connection path at a given time” is explicitly taught by Golden as establishing a single reserved connection path through a switch from one host to another (col. 9 ln. 14 - col. 10 ln. 45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Metin with Golden. To do so only requires that hosts are logically grouped in groups of two. See the motivation to combine in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 14, Metin discloses “parsing in said first device header information [...] for determining whether the received packet is a bandwidth reservation request message” as a switch that is capable of using RSVP (pg. 4 paragraph 40) and recognizing reservation request messages (pg. 4 paragraph 39).

Regarding claim 15, Metin discloses “MAC addresses are stored and compared with packet information for determining reserved connection stream packets” as control logic and memory in a switch (pg. 3 paragraph 35, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 16, Metin discloses “IP addresses are stored and compared with packet information for determining reserved connection stream packets” as control logic and memory in a switch (pg. 3 paragraph 35, Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 17, Metin discloses “the first network switch device forwarding the reserved connection request to a second network switch device in the path downstream” as passing along the reservation request (paragraph 40, Fig. 3 step 16A).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Heinz et al. US 7,167,648 B2 discloses a switch that has a plurality of output queues and is capable of allocating bandwidth to prioritize traffic.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON RECEK whose telephone number is (571)270-1975. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Recek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2142

(571)-270-1975

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142